The Reply

$1.00 Yearly | August, 1913 | 10 Cents Copy

An Anti-Suffrage Magazine

Volume 1

Number 4

Application for entry as second-class matter at the Post Office at New Canaan, Conn., pending

The Reply

Helen S. Harman-Brown, Editor and Publisher

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT NEW CANAAN, CONNECTICUT
ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO "THE REPLY," BOX 1526, NEW CANAAN, CONN.

PRINTED AT THE MAC-A-NAN PRESS, NEW CANAAN, CONN.
THE REPLY IS ON SALE AT BRENTANO'S, FIFTH AVENUE AND TWENTY-SEVENTH ST., NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Editorial		73
The Truth About Illinois	By Caroline F. Corbin	75
Colorado	By Elizabeth Cass Goddard	77
Notes on the Congressional Hearing Before the Committee on Suffrage	By Helen Kendrick Johnson	78
Militancy Perfectly Logical	By Mrs. William Forse Scott	81
Why I Do Not Believe in Suffrage for Women	By Grace Nicoll	82
Correspondence	By Miss Clara M. Hill and Mrs. William Forse Scott	83
Women of Today	By George Creel	85
Is It Worth While	By William S. Pettit	86
Sharp Questions Rout Suffragists	——	89
Best Women Not at Polls Out in Denver	By Helen Ware	92
Against Educated Women	By Professor Pembrey	93
Summary of the Mad Deeds of the English Suffragettes	——	94
Anti-Suffrage Organizations		95

As the financial support of a magazine comes largely from its success as an advertising medium, we trust that all who want to help the work which THE REPLY has undertaken, will not only read all its advertisements, but patronize its carefully selected advertisers

WOMAN
AND THE
REPUBLIC

A survey of the Woman Suffrage Movement in the United States and a Discussion of the Claims and Arguments of its Foremost Advocates

By

Helen Kendrick Johnson

12 mo., 359 pages

Third Edition in Press

Price by mail, 30 Cents

Published by The Guidon Club, 3 W. 87th Street
New York City

"A dissertation full of social, political and moral scholarship, flanked on all sides by genuine common sense and the logic of evidence. It is a really valuable document."—Washington Times.

"Possibly there has been written a clearer, more impartial, more masterly work than this; but, if so, it has never been our good fortune to meet with it."—Denver Times.

"This book will hold the reader's attention from beginning to end."
—New York Commercial Advertiser.

"A book that deserves a very careful and thoughtful reading, especially by the women of this country."—Boston Home Journal.

Parcels Post makes shopping by mail easy. Why not write, as well as visit our advertisers

The Reply

An Anti-Suffrage Magazine

August, 1913

EDITORIAL

THE Suffragists are making every effort to offset the bad impression made by Mrs. Belmont's reported interviews in New York and London. In the former city, she threatened that if New York did not enfranchise its women, the Suffragists would resort to the English militant methods. In London, in an interview with the correspondent of the Associated Press, she corroborated her former statement, as follows: "I meant what I said before leaving the United States. If New York fails to awake, we shall introduce militant methods of the type used by the Women's Social and Political Union." With all their wonderful ingenuity in advertising, this important stand of one of their most valuable leaders is not noted in the Suffrage press! Far from it. American men are patted on the back, cajoled and flattered, with the often repeated remarks about the American man's generosity, and we are told that American men need only to be convinced that the women want the ballot, and it will be handed to the spoiled children on a silver salver! How comes it that this leader—a member of the most indulged class of women in the world—ventures to publish such threats? Has she no following in Suffrage circles? Surely so keen and powerful a leader must voice the sentiment of at least one faction! Suffragists claim, and truly, that the English militants are but one faction, but do we in America look forward with pleasure to these imported methods of Suffrage work? Every now and then, in unobtrusive corners of the public prints, little notices will be found, headed, "In Defence of Militancy," "Goes to Join the Militants," "Militants Nothing Short of Magnificent," and so on. The expression of American Suffragists' views favorable to militancy. Suffragists, on the one hand deny the existence of chivalry, while actually catering to that obsolete trait. We are constantly told that "Militant methods will never be needed in America," while, we are, at the same time being threatened with them, and the following echo of Mrs. John Winters Brannan's remarks remains as an unpleasant reminder of still another American Suffrage leader's attitude

towards militancy: "It is quite possible that if the Eastern States continue to deny enfranchisement to the women, while the Western States continue to grant it, the women thus discriminated against would find the political anamoly of their position so impossible to bear that even militancy would seem to them justifiable."

THE colors of the English militants—purple, green and white—colors which stand for actual revolution, are seen far too often in this country to encourage the belief in the statement by Suffragists, that they do not uphold the methods for which they stand. In a Connecticut town there is shown in a window, rented by the local Suffragettes for an "exhibit," a portrait of Abraham Lincoln, framed in these colors of the nation, which for a time used every means to frustrate his efforts to free the slaves of the South—colors, which represent a greater danger to the stability of our government than did ever the flag of the Confederacy.

At the hearing of the Suffragists before the legislature of the same State, the Senate chamber was filled with these militant colors and flags. How patient are the men of America with the inconsistencies of their women!

THE phenomenal growth of THE REPLY'S circulation since the appearance of the first number is a source of gratification to the publisher, but it should only whet the ambition of both the anti-Suffrage workers and the editor. Suffragists work all the time, but the majority of women opposed to Woman Suffrage, with the feeling of security which characterizes all Americans, remain inactive through ignorance of the need for work. The average American woman, and the average woman is undoubtedly opposed to Woman Suffrage, has no idea of the fact that her country needs her more at the present time, perhaps, than at any time in its history. She is needed to record the one vote that will save her country from retrogression—her vote against Woman Suffrage. Did she realize this, would the cry, "Rouse the indifferent," be that most often heard? We, who feel that all the bassic principles of life are endangered by the Woman Suffrage movement (movement, not progress!) urge you to consider present day conditions THE REPLY aims to show these conditions as they exist and will be glad to answer any questions on this subject. Among its contributors are men and women who have made a study of the Suffrage question. These earnest thinkers will gladly give the readers of THE REPLY the benefit of their investigations. Though published in Connecticut, we have subscribers and contributors all over the United States and some of our most active agents are in the Suffrage States. THE REPLY also aims to be an open forum for free expression and interchange of opinion. As such, it will be of value to all. To Anti-Suffragists, it is of great importance that their view of this question be widely circulated. A subscription for THE REPLY sent into a small town may be the means of starting an organization opposed to Woman Suffrage. In any case, after reading the magazine, much good may result from mailing it to a friend.

The Truth About Illinois

By Caroline F. Corbin, President Illinois Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

THE situation of the Woman Suffrage question in Illinois is one very difficult for the general public to understand, especially in face of the many and flagrant misrepresentations which are published in the newspapers both of the East and West.

In fact, as published documents prove, the Anti-Suffrage movement commenced in Illinois in the early 80's of the last century and had been diligently prosecuted for eleven years before any organization was formed. It had gained open governmental recognition and encouragement in several countries in Europe because it had from the first made opposition to Socialism a part of its program, in fact a necessary part of it. Woman Suffrage had by the showing of the writings of Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, Wm. Liebknecht and others of the prominent Socialists of the eighteenth century, originated from and was a part of that Revolutionary Socialism which had been recognized as a deadly foe to all modern civilization. Thus as early as 1885 Illinois took up the cudgels against Socialism and by that means gained the deadly enmity of Mrs. Stanton, Miss Anthony, Mrs. Stone, and all that colony of women who followed Francis D. Wright, a pronounced and most advanced Socialist (see Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony's "History of Woman Suffrage") and who were represented by the Suffragists as the founders of woman's rights in America

Both Massachusetts and New York had availed themselves freely of the literature, consisting of protests, etc., which was put forth by the Illinois contingent opposed to Woman Suffrage, but both had declined to recognize the movement against Socialism, because they were not yet convinced that Woman Suffrage and Socialism were in reality one. The Illinois Anti-Suffragists were therefore constrained to pursue their work quietly, leaving the open opposition to Socialism, which, though not included in their name, was always a leading part of their propaganda, to make its own way unaided by the more sensational tactics of the other two societies.

Its effect upon the middle West were however, plainly marked. Ohio, Wisconsin, Michigan and other States recorded such victories that at last it became evident to all noting the course of the warfare, that unless Illinois could be subjugated there would be little hope for the rest of the United States. It was at that moment that a prominent Socialist of Europe, after a visit to America with the purpose of forwarding the Socialist cause, was reported to have said in London that "the Anti-Suffrage cause was greatly damaging the cause in America and there seemed no hope for a victory there except through Socialism."

It was not until 1912 that it became evident that there was no hope for the success of Socialism in this country unless it should be clearly allied with such success as Woman Suffrage had already acquired, and the far West became at that time the open ground of Socialist endeavor.

It was evident, however, that unless this modern and heretical danger could cross the Mississippi river and acquire a foothold in the middle West, where, until that time Illinois had reigned supreme as the opponent of Socialism, it could not succeed. It was therefore determined to make a persistent onslaught in that State. Already Chicago, its chief city, had returned an informal verdict nearly two to one against Woman Suffrage and it was evident to most dwellers in Chicago that this was but a mere sample of what it would do if regularly called upon to record its actual verdict. The two standard parties of the State, Republican and Democratic, had decided unanimously in their conventions to omit all allusion to Woman Suffrage in their platforms. This spoke for Chicago, while the lower part of the State was conceded by the oldest and most aggressive of the Suffragists to be almost without a trace of Woman Suffrage sentiment. Still the legislature by its two hundred members, had the power to overcome entirely the overwhelming vote of the State, and force political responsibilities upon the large majority of the quiet home-loving women they pretended to represent by voting for a law giving them a right to vote. It is just here that the difficulty to outsiders begins.

In 1897, following the example of the Massachusetts and New York Associations, we became organized. It appeared to be supposed that we should at once adopt the plan of these two Associations, which had previously copied the methods of the Suffrage Associations of their respective States and worked for an open competition for women and funds as against their opponents. A few months trial of this plan convinced us that we had been making better progress especially as combating Socialism and the growing heresy of the time, under the system we had always followed heretofore, and we gradually returned to it. It is more than doubtful if we could have held the position which we have occupied in the middle West if we had courted publicity and made a display of our strength. That we felt, might do for the East but not for the West. It came to be seen, however, by those working against us, that little could be accomplished by their methods in this State. So true was this that in June, 1912, it was said by one of the Suffrage leaders, "We have done our best for more than twenty years, but we have never yet been able to get a Suffrage measure through the legislature."

In the fall of 1912 the prospect was quite similar, but at the very end of the session, by means of what our newspapers and the best known of the Suffragists themselves called a "riot," a bill was forced through the legislature which the attorney general of the State openly pronounced unconstitutional before its passage on the floor of the House, giving to women of this State a partial right to vote.

The bill required the signature of the Governor before it could become a law, but the excitement was so great (the papers reported that there was "four hours of heated debate") that the Governor preferred, by the advice of the attorney general, to let the bill go to the supreme court of the State for adjudication. The question is not settled yet, but on the strength of this compromise, the Suffragists of this and other States, have openly declared that a limited Suffrage for women has been gained in our legislature.

In the meantime the antis of Illinois will spare no pains to show the truth of their contention, that Woman Suffrage is not a woman's movement at all, but sprang in its first inception from the Socialistic scheme of Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, and their compeers.

Colorado

By Elizabeth Cass Goddard

Some facts regarding the schools of Colorado. Taken from the recent report of the Russell Sage Foundation and other authoritative sources:

Colorado stands Sixth in the daily cost per child in the public schools. In 1893 Colorado stood First.

Colorado now stands Twenty-fourth in length of school year. In 1903 Colorado stood Seventh.

Colorado now stands Twenty-second in number of school days per child (compulsory)—having been outstripped since 1903 in this respect by many other States.

Colorado now stands Seventh in expense per child enrolled. In 1903 Colorado stood Third—New York standing first and Massachusetts second.

Colorado now stands Fourth in percentage of children of school age in school.

Colorado stands Tenth in value of school property per child of school age.

Colorado stands Eighth in the item of teachers' salaries.

Colorado stands Fourteenth in the number of pupils enrolled in high school as compared to the number enrolled in the elementary schools.

Colorado stands Twentieth in school expenditure as compared with the total estimated valuation of all real and personal property, spending thirty-two cents on public education on each hundred dollars of property. Washington, for instance, spends seventy-two cents and Oklahoma seventy-five cents.

Colorado stands Thirty-ninth in attendance of pupils enrolled—there seeming to be no good reason for this bad record any more than for the others here mentioned.

Colorado stands Ninth in the final summary of the ten foregoing items. In 1903 it was conceded by the foreign education commissions visiting this country that Colorado stood first in this general summary.

Colorado stands Seventeenth among the forty-eight States in illiteracy—3 7-10% cannot read or write. What is the matter with Colorado?

During the past ten years expenditures for public education have more than doubled in the United States. Colorado's expenditures have stood stationary.

What is the reason for this discouraging state of things? How can it be reconciled with the claims of the advocates of Woman Suffrage, which has prevailed here for nearly twenty years? Especially in view of the fact that the state superintendent of public instruction has for many years been invariably a woman?

Notes on the Congressional Hearing Before the Committee on Suffrage

By Helen Kendrick Johnson

THE April hearing before the United States Senate Suffrage Committee was, in many respects, the most surprising in the statements put forth by them of any of the many held in the Senate chamber in all the past, and the following is, probably, the very most surprising of its recorded utterances. They say: "In this Republic we are engaged in a struggle against fraud and violence, avarice and stupidity—a struggle in behalf of liberty and justice—and it will promote the success of this struggle to add to the present class of voters one other class, the women, to whom the materialistic is generally submerged for the idealistic."

Who, we may ask, are engaged in this struggle, and who are the enemies against whom they propose to contend with the help of women's votes? The defenders of liberty and justice appear to be the Congressional labor lobby controlled by Mr. Gompers, and the packed Suffrage committee composed of Senators from the Suffrage States, while the promoters of fraud and violence, avarice and stupidity, against whom they must contend, appear to be the majority of the Senate and House of Representatives and the American people at large, especially the vast majority of its women. Such a statement as this, publicly made by a Senate committee, is not to be lightly dismissed from thought. It constitutes a serious menace, and it suggests that the temper of the body to which it appeals has indeed submerged the materialistic for the idealistic, as it concieves it, and defends a resort to the bomb and the torch while it does not attempt to present to the country a genuine record of the lessening of fraud and violence, avarice and stupidity through the votes of women. Let leaders who put forth such statements beware. The new-made Woman Suffrage States are all of them under the ban of a possible charge of unconstitutionality in their legislative action. "The Revolution" is the thing urged by and upon the women who pushed this defiant legislation. Mrs. Stanton, writing to a Suffrage convention in Washington, predicted that the time was not far distant when women would "strike hands with labor, with Socialists, with anarchists, and we should see the scenes of the Revolution of France acted over again in this Republic." Let any would-be Dantons, Robespeirres and Marats remember the "Furies" of the "Terror," and a slight young girl who, having "submerged the materialistic for the idealistic," considered it her contribution to liberty and justice to commit murder. "L'ami du Peuple"—"Liberte," "Equalite," "Fraternite," these cries are chaunted again to the strains of the Marsiellaise as the feminist movement marches through our streets with every accompaniment of spectacular display.

By far the most striking and interesting

figure of the Suffrage hearing at Washington was Senator Shafroth, of Denver, Colorado. One thing in the record of his remarks is this: "Upon the question of expediency, those people who have lived in the States where Woman Suffrage has existed have found that it is expedient, because it puts into politics an element that is for good." This statement is contradicted from so many authoratitative sources that it was audacious to make it. He knew that he had himself been constrained to resign his former seat in the United States Senate because of the frauds proved concerning his election, perpetrated principally by women. Of that event the New York Sun said at the time: "The Shafroth case is especially interesting in view of its bearing upon Woman Suffrage. The women of Colorado enjoy the right to vote, and the record in the Boynge-Shafroth contest shows that they were the perpetrators of the frauds; that they were repeaters and vote-buyers; and that they padded the polling-lists and stuffed the ballot-boxes. These frauds were not committed in the interest of Mr. Shafroth directly, but for the purpose of electing the Democratic ticket; and he with others profited by the illegal methods employed." This is ancient, though none the less, effective history, but clearly in mind must have been the same gentleman's act when, as Governor of Colorado, he uttered the following stinging rebuke and warning concerning the gambling race-track bill: "If this bill becomes a law, the finger of scorn and ridicule will ever after be pointed at the influence of woman's franchise in State affairs." It is well known that this action is all that prevented it from becoming law, and that the legislative record showed that the four women legislators voted in favor of the measure. Again, the Senator could not avoid knowing that when a member of the Denver Board of Aldermen introduced a bill to promote moral decency and social protection by making it a misdemeanor for the proprietors of cafes to serve women patrons with intoxicating liquors, the Woman's Public Service League sent to them to say: "We hereby protest against the passage of any measure which places restrictions upon the freedom of action of women which are not placed upon the freedom of action of men, and we respectfully request your honorable body to defeat any measure of this character that may be presented." Suffrage equality demands equal right for the setters of public morals to be first in the tearing down of society that is proceeding under such auspices as this. Last Autumn the Colorado towns that voted in favor of the liquor traffic, did so through their woman voters of this stripe. It does not seem to be known, or remembered, that woman liquor dealers and bartenders and the like have increased in proportion to women in other public business, while woman drinkers in all classes of society have kept pace with the growth of the feminist movement.

Two items from Colorado are of profound significance. One is the announcement, made now with a bill of particulars, that the political women of Colorado will form a "Woman's Party," through which to punish the men because the results of their votes are set aside, and especially are they allowed no handling of patronage, without which influence is of no avail! What a confession, both as to character of their political ideals and as to the evidence that a woman's vote is only a "blank cartridge" ballot. The piece of

paper dropped in a box has no power. The vote is not an expression of opinion, it is a pledge to government that the one who drops the ballot stands ready to give physical service in defence of resulting law, if need be. This is what makes a vote sovereign, and, in confidence, men in the Suffrage States confess that they would not dare to hesitate to set aside women's votes if they deemed it expedient. Of what avail would be a "Woman's Party?" It would be easier to manipulate than a scattering woman's vote.

The other significant item is the published statement of twenty of Colorado's finest women to the effect that Woman Suffrage has produced no beneficial results; the politics are as corrupt as ever, and that the women at large would rejoice to see the franchise removed.

Couldn't Stand the Strain

Miss Clara A. Jess, the first and only woman justice of the peace in California, has resigned the place to which she was appointed at Daly City about a year ago. She found the responsibilities of her office, albeit she had actually little to do, "too great a nervous strain." "I doubt," she said, whether women could stand the strain, though there is nothing in their impulses and emotions preventing them from rendering just as good decisions as men. Then the women didn't give me any organized support. If they had, it might have been different. I am not so sure as I was about women voting, and all that. Sometimes I think that the I. W. W.'s have the right idea—that the ballot doesn't amount to much anyway." All of which is distinctly worth the attention of those interested in observing the social effects of woman's "emancipation" in California—Exchange.

Godiva as an Example

LONDON, July 9—Addressing the members of the International Women's Franchise League on "Petticoat Government" today, Laurence Housman, the author, said that the most remarkable example in the history of "unpetticoat government" was that of Lady Godiva. He wished all women would take her as their patron and example, and again and again do violence to their conventional sense of modesty in order to shame men into just ways.

"In war against evil," said Mr. Housman, "it is not always sufficient to gird the loins. Sometimes it is necessary to strip." —The New York Times.

Mr. Housman's idea, in short, is to send the militants to Coventry.—Evening Sun.

Militancy Perfectly Logical

By Mrs. William Forse Scott

WE ARE constantly surprised at the failure of the Suffragists to come out squarely in favor of militancy. From the Anti-Suffrage point of view, the militants are perfectly justified in fighting. It is the only logical thing to do. That is why we are opposed to Woman Suffrage.

Government, good or bad, belongs to the party that can hold the reins of government. The practical "right" to govern has always lain with the "power" to govern, and when there is a contention as to who has the power, it has always been tried out by the way as old as the world—by a fight. In the nature of things, in the nature of government, these must be so, and so the militants in a childish way are doing the necessary thing to get possession of a power held by men, which men as yet are not willing to yield without a struggle. If they were willing to give up their power it would be because they have already lost it One of the great fears of strong women (women big enough of heart and mind to submit to authority) is that men are becoming feminized, that they are losing their right to govern because they are losing their power to govern.

Whether this is due to luxury, or to fierce industrial competition, or to women teachers, or to racial decadence, or to any other cause, it is time for men to set their faces against it, and time for them to refuse to allow women either to support or to govern them. When women as a class even support themselves they will surely govern not only themselves, but men as well. Will you picture the men of such an era? Such men and such women have existed and there is no law of nature which can prevent their reappearance.

When women gain the right to govern because they have the power, the first exercise of that power will be the seizing by force, armed force if necessary, the control of the State. If New York and Pennsylvania and Massachusetts hold the movement in check we will doubtless have militant demonstrations in this country, for there are Suffragists logical enough to acknowledge the element of force in government.

But the feminine interpretation of force is not only amusing but illuminating as well. There has been nothing in all the history of destruction and cruelty in England to show that the militants have any more mature conception of fighting for a cause than a pack of excited and angry children who kick and bite and scratch instead of buying guns to kill.

The inability of the women to rise to a proper conception of organized armed opposition or demand, shows them still lacking the right to govern because they still lack the power.

Why I Do Not Believe in Suffrage for Women

By Grace Nicoll

BECAUSE OF

1. The added burden to women, especially the working women.

2. The enormous and expensive additional machinery for registering and counting the double quantity of votes.

3. The lack of necessity for the women's vote. There is always some good man to present a good bill and to present it more logically than the average woman.

4. The marked incompetency of women in the "spheres" already admittedly hers. Witness the lack of proper training of children and the condition of the servant problem in the average American home.

5. The extremely personal standpoint of women who would vote most enthusiastically on subjects which particularly interested them and would pay no attention to the others.

6. The inability of the woman's vote to do much that is claimed for it. Such reforms as the eight-hour day for men, for instance, was not gained through the vote but through the influence of the labor unions.

REMARKS

The writer does not believe the Suffrage slogan, "power educates." It seems to her a costly and wasteful form of education.

To the argument that "women are, at least, as good as men," the writer would ask—Why duplicate inefficiency?

QUESTIONS

Question—What is the best way to double the illiterate vote?

Answer—Add the ignorant woman vote to that of the ignorant man—a few intelligent votes would of course be gained by this—but the sum total of the unintelligent would be doubled.

Q.—What is the best answer to Jane Addams' demand for the vote?

A.—The splendid work that she is doing without it.

Q.—Who are willing, after due deliberation, to give women everything they ask for?

A.—Men!

PRACTICAL QUESTIONS

Why did men ever get up labor unions if the vote, which they have always had, could bring about an eight-hour day, employer's liability and other good industrial conditions? Why not women's unions, then, instead of the useless vote?

Since the women who really do the duties of woman (duties which no one else can do) perform eight-tenths of the work of the world now, why should the remaining two-tenths—or thereabouts—be piled upon their shoulders?

Since women holding property receive every protection for it without the vote, why burden them with unnecessary political responsibility?

What becomes of the argument of "taxation without representation" when you reflect that if a man owns a house in one place and a store in another, he votes in only one of the districts, but pays taxes in both; would you have Mr. Childs, the restaurant man, vote on every few blocks in New York city because he pays taxes there?

Since there are said to be 5,000,000 women in industry, concentrated (so the Suffragists tell us) largely in Massachusetts, New York and Pennsylvania; since these women are mostly under the voting age anyway, and are constantly leaving outside industries and marrying, why should Federal laws for 22,000,000 women (or more) be adapted entirely to the changing 5,000,000 in these states?

What possible interest has the average woman in the comptroller of the port, or the public registrar? Yet these are among the officials whom the woman, over-burdened already by real tasks in the home, will have to investigate and elect.

CONCLUSION

If the Constitution is to be amended why not urge an amendment restricting the male franchise to those who USE, and do not barter away their votes.

Correspondence

40 West Ave., Norwalk, Conn.,
July 7, 1913.

To the Editor of THE REPLY:

My dear Miss Harman-Brown: In the June issue of THE REPLY you published a part of Mrs. William Forse Scott's address at Stamford on the 27th of May.

As Mrs. Scott referred to me by name several times, I feel justified in correcting some mis-statements. Mrs. Scott probably was not in Stamford during the week of our Suffrage campaign, and she was evidently entirely misinformed as to what I had said, either in private conversation or in public speaking. I shall not attempt to touch upon all the details of what I was reported as having said, that would take too much of your space. I simply say that, on every point except one, I have always said, and did say, on the day to which Mrs. Scott evidently referred, exactly the contrary of what Mrs. Scott reported me as saying. I should indeed be "a very ignorant person" had I made any of those wild statements attributed to me. But the particular statement which called forth Mrs. Scott's characterization of me in that way, and which was the only one correctly reported, was not made on my own authority. It was the report of an international commission, the Inter-Parliamentary Union, to the effect that the Colorado group of laws relating to child life in its various aspects of education, home and labor, "are the sanest, most humane, most progressive and most scientific laws relating to the child to be found on any statute books in the world."

At the close of Mrs. Scott's address, when the meeting was thrown open for

questions, I made these corrections, but she had, doubtless, already sent you the manuscript, and it was too late to correct the mistake.

I feel sure that, although we see this question of Woman Suffrage from different sides, you have no desire to misrepresent your opponents, and so will gladly give space to this letter, that the people who saw the original statement may see the correction.

Sincerely yours,
CLARA M. HILL.

To the Editor of THE REPLY:

Dear Madam: Miss Clara M. Hill feels that she has been misrepresented by me in my rebuttal of the Suffrage speeches made in Stamford during the convention held there. The above letter enables Miss Hill to make such corrections as she deems essential, and I need hardly assure her that if I have misrepresented her I regret it sincerely. In order to make it clear that there was no such intention, it seems only fair to put the whole matter before your readers.

Miss Hill says, "on every point except one I have always said, and did say, on the day to which Mrs. Scott evidently referred, exactly the contrary of what Mrs. Scott reported me as saying. I should indeed be 'a very ignorant person' had I made any of those wild statements attributed to me." Miss Hill further says that the only statement correctly reported was not made on her own authority, but on that of an "international commission." We should be indebted to Miss Hill if she would tell us something about this "commission." Under what authority does it exist? To whom does it report? We have been hearing for several years of its opinion of the Colorado child-labor laws, but its fame is confined to that one pronouncement.

If Miss Hill accepts as reliable authority this peripatetic "commission," she will be able, doubtless, to clear up the obscurity surrounding it.

I take pleasure in stating the references to Miss Hill's Suffrage speech in Stamford to which she takes exception. On page 29 of the June issue of THE REPLY, I have said: "Will Miss Hill, who said that legislators say to women 'that their requests are all right, but they have no time to attend to them' give the names of the legislators she quotes, and the time, place and circumstances?" If she "said exactly the contrary" she has contradicted a statement which her party has been making so persistently as to give it a phonographic quality. We are glad she knows better.

On page 30, "Miss Hill sees in democracy a sure promise of escape from social, political and industrial evil. She pictures the state of perfect happiness to come when women vote." If Miss Hill said exactly the contrary of what is implied here, she has suffered a reaction to Anti-Suffrage opinions which carry her further than the anti-Suffragists are ready to go.

On page 31: "As to the guardianship law, she shows, as do other Suffragists, an irritating ignorance of the question she undertakes to elucidate."

This is only my opinion of her opinion, not a statement of her opinion. These are the only references to Miss Hill made by me, and I am very glad to submit them to the readers of THE REPLY for correction by Miss Hill.

MRS. WILLIAM FORSE SCOTT.
First Vice-President of the Guidon Club,
Opposed to Woman Suffrage.
Yonkers, N. Y., July 12, 1913.

Women of Today

By George Creel

Extracts from the Metropolitan Magazine of June, 1913. Discussed by Kate C. Towle

"The 'best man' on the Denver police force happens to be a woman."

"No movement, it may be mentioned, has ever experienced the slghtest difficulty in securing generals. It is getting privates that gives all the trouble. That's where Josephine Roche comes in—she's a born private . . ."

"It was in the summer of 1912 that Ben Lindsay, judge of the juvenile court, and George Creel, police commissioner, secured the adoption of an ordinance establishing the city's right to control and regulate dance-halls, moving picture shows, skating rinks and all other forms of commercialized amusement with respect to the greater protection of children. The need of such supervision had long been evident, for out of the city's neglect and indifference there had been flowing daily a sad and shameful list of youthful delinquencies and depravities that broke the hearts of mothers and gave recruits to the oldest trade in the world."

"The ordinance was fought bitterly . . ." and the framers of the ordinance breathed a sigh of relief when Josephine Roche consented to give up her work in New York and become the "lady cop."

"She was one who had done things—those inspiring things that are remote from personal benefit and concerned only with the common good."

Colorado is one of the oldest Suffrage States in the Union. The women of Denver have voted for about twenty years and if equal suffrage is a panacea for social evils because women are naturally more moral than men, then why should the shocking conditions which George Creel describes in the foregoing paragraphs have been allowed to exist by the women of Denver?

If the vote opens to women a wider social and political field of work, then why must the city of Denver, with its twenty years of "votes for women," send to the city of New York, where women do not vote, for a woman capable of filling the new office of "lady cop"?

If facts supported the theory of equal suffrage, the city of Denver would have no need of a "lady cop." But if it had, it would be leading and not following, it would be exporting to non-suffrage States, and not importing from them, its "lady cops."

Woman White Slaver Goes to Jail

Sheriff Harburger took yesterday Rosie Hertz, the proprietress of several white slave dens, to Blackwell's Island, to begin her sentence of one year's imprisonment. Mrs. Hertz has been held in the Tombs since February 3 on her promise that she would reveal police graft in the white slave traffic.—The New York Times.

This woman would have a vote, too!

Is It Worth While?

An Address by William S. Pettit

Counselor William S. Pettit, in addressing the Woman Suffrage Club of Far Rockaway, is reported in a local paper as follows:

"While Mr. Pettit told the women that he favored their having the privilege of voting, he pointed out to them the consequent loss of many advantages they now enjoy. The question for them to decide was whether the gaining of the ballot was worth what it would carry with it.

"In part, Mr. Pettit said: 'I have never before attended a Woman's Suffrage meeting and must confess that I am not yet convinced just what the women are seeking. I have read in the papers about women "hiking" to Albany and to Washington, but I am something like our Chinese friend, Dr. Kinn, who said at the Progress Society that she did not see just what walking to Albany had to do with women voting, when she could go there by train just as well, and with much less trouble. I likewise read a great deal about the English women smashing windows, men's silk hats, and works of art, but it seems to me that these acts spoil the cause and becloud the real issues.

"Underlying all this confusion there is a body of serious-minded, earnest women, who being rightfully dissatisfied with political conditions, believe that if the women could vote and share the responsibility of government, she could work a reformation, especially along certain lines. It is to this body of women that I believe I am talking to this evening.

"Is it the vote only that women want? Is it 'political equality' the women are seeking? Again, yes and no. Judging from the States in which the franchise is granted to the women, political equality soon follows the vote. What is meant by political equality? We must go to the friends of Woman Suffrage for the answer.

"A few weeks ago Assemblyman Couvellier, who has championed Women Suffrage, presented a bill to the legislature which in substance provided that there should be no discrimination or distinction in our civil, personal and property laws because of sex. This bill is the direct result of the advocation for political equality. This law will ultimately give women the right to vote and may benefit her in other respects, but is she willing to make the sacrifices it involves?

"Let us consider for a moment the rights and privileges women enjoy which are affected by this law.

"First. Women's sacred dower, which she has enjoyed in English speaking countries from very early times. Man today cannot convey a good title to his real estate in New York, and in most States, without the consent of his wife, but she can convey her real estate without his consent.

"A husband owning real estate cannot disinherit his wife, and yet wives can disinherit their husbands.

"A husband is compelled to support his wife and family and can be thrown into prison if he fail so to do, but a woman is

not obliged to support her husband in most States, or her family, regardless of the wealth of the woman and the poverty of her husband.

"Again, in New York and most States, the law implies that the wife is the agent of the husband. She can purchase any necessary and compel her husband to pay for it, but the law does not permit the merchant to recover from the wife for goods he has purchased, regardless of the wealth of the wife or the poverty of the husband.

"If there be marital controversies the law permits the wife to employ an attorney to sue her husband and compels the husband to pay the lawyer's fee, but the law does not in any case compel the wife to pay the husband's legal expenses regardless of the financial standing of the two parties. The law allows the wife alimony pending the action, but never allows the man alimony.

"If Assemblyman Couvellier's law becomes effective in New York, it will destroy these rights and privileges that women enjoy because these man-made laws do discriminate in woman's favor.

"Are the women without very, very seriously considering the question, going to allow lazy husbands to escape the responsibility of supporting their wives and families.

"In some of the States which have granted the women the right of Suffrage, there are laws which make her jointly responsible with her husband for the support of the family and in one year six husbands in Utah recovered divorces on the ground that their wives failed to support them. In a number of States where the vote has been given to women, she has been put on equality with man and lost her right of dower. Think, ladies, of a woman with a family being hailed to court for the non-support of her husband, when the money is not within her reach.

'I have read a number of rather reckless statements in reference to the laws of New York. Let me say briefly, first, that women in New York have all the property rights of man and all the independence of man in the making of contracts.

"Second. That women in New York today enjoy many privileges and immunities not granted to men.

"Third. Notwithstanding statements to the contrary, mothers have equal rights over the children that their fathers have.

"To me the question of Woman's Suffrage is not a question of equality or superiority of one sex over another. It is not merely a question as to whether women have the right or have not the right, or shall have the right or shall not have the right to vote. It is a question of expediency. If the majority of the women want to vote, I say, above all things, let them vote. I believe the women are going to get the ballot. I am not sure she is making a good bargain. I am not sure that what she is giving up, very much more than compensates for what she is receiving, and I wish above all things to have you consider the question from all points of view. Look at it as you would look at any business contract. First, let her consider the price she is paying. Second, let her consider what she is actually receiving, stripped of all sentimentalities and light sounding phrases and then let her reckon the carrying charges.

"For the convenience of discussion, we might divide men voters into two classes. First, the thoughtful men who consider

economic conditions and discuss political issues and think intelligently upon propositions. Second, men who give no thought to economical conditions and vote as bosses, leaders or as friends tell them or simply vote a party ticket because their father did before them. The women, as I understand it, want votes because they expect to change existing conditions. This claim is based upon the assumption that the majority of women when given the ballot will allay themselves with the first mentioned group of men, that is, with the thoughtful, intelligent men. These groups today, as shown by the last election, are about equally divided and the thoughtful and intelligent vote is increasing with education and with the years.

"But how will the women allay themselves with the thoughtful voters? Your answer may be that the women will do just as well as the men are doing, but the reply is that if you are going to change existing conditions, the women must do better than the men are doing, else the vote to women will be futile.

"I notice at many of the Suffrage meetings that a clamor is made for new laws. That is unfortunate. We have altogether too many new laws today and what we need most is the enforcement of present laws.

"Some kind friend left at my desk the other day "The Woman Voter." I notice that much space is given in this magazine to the question of new laws and to the discussion of existing vice. You cannot legislate people into being good. That must come from within rather than from without.

"Woman today, by our laws is recognized as the mother of mankind. Man has surrounded her with every protection and the laws discriminate very much in her favor. Man and woman are God's noblest creatures and I hope that the women will not advocate doctrines that tend to create sex hatred. I trust that they will not destroy in the minds of the coming generations the veneration and respect that each sex has for the other."

Notwithstanding the Mr. Pettit's opening statement that "he favored" women "having the privilege of voting," THE REPLY considered his address one of the most masterly arguments against the enfranchisement of women that has yet been presented.

The Suffragist's Dilemma

I shall not vote for Mrs. Briggs,
  I do not like her gown;
And I remember well the digs
  I got from Clara Brown.
Jemima Patterson Magee
  Shall get no vote of mine;
A horrid, stuck-up thing is she—
  And also I decline
To vote for Anastasia Bunce,
  I fairly boil with rage
When I recall that more than once
  She lied about my age.
And Mable Jones and Agnes Carr
  And Clementina Ball,
I'll scratch, because they never are
  "At home" the days I call.
I can not vote, you understand,
  For Angelina Pratt,
Because she isn't stylish, and
  She wears a last year's hat.

Oh, goodness me! That brings me through
  The list. This ballot's small.
There's no one left. What SHALL I do?
  I CAN NOT VOTE AT ALL!

—Springfield (Mass.) Union.

Sharp Questions Rout Suffragists

Dramatic Scene on Borough Hall Steps When Male Listener Interrupts. Invited to the Platform But Prevented from Speaking Because He Lacked a Permit

From The Brooklyn Daily Eagle, July 10

PLAIN talk, ending in the retreat of the Suffragist orators, marked the meeting held on the steps of Borough Hall last evening. It was one of the liveliest meetings held there for some time, and the thunder and lightning storm that followed several hours later had little on the gathering for pyrotechnics.

A man Suffragist was sailing along in a terrific tirade against the men for "monopolizing all the privileges of life and giving the women nothing but restriction," when a man in the crowd asked the privilege of making an inquiry. When the request was granted he asked:

"You have just said that the men have all the privileges. May I ask who had the privileges when the Titanic went down? Was it the men or the women?"

"I don't understand you," said the man.

"All right," said the questioner. "Let's get a little nearer home. When men are sent to the Island for not supporting their wives, who have the privilege then—the men or the women?

"If that is not plain, let me get closer home yet. When a young man and a young woman violate the moral code, the young man is sent to jail and the girl goes free. Who has the privilege then—the man or the woman?"

At this point a young woman who had just spoken drew the male Suffragist aside and stepped into the breach like Horatius at the bridge.

"However that may be," she said, "when they raid disorderly houses, why are the young women sent to jail, while the men go free?"

"For the very simple reason," replied the questioner, "that the men occupy a very different status before the law than the women in that case. This is an unpleasant subject and I am sorry that the speaker has injected it into the discussion."

"Will the man take this platform and make his explanation?" asked the young woman.

"I most certainly will," said the man, as he started for the platform.

"Wait, wait," came from several Suffragists, "have you a permit to speak?"

"I don't wish to make any address," replied the man. "I asked a question, and you told me to take the platform. I am not desirous of taking the platform."

Thereupon a number of persons in the crowd shouted, "Give him the platform," "Let's hear what he has to say," etc.

"All right," said the young woman. "I shall ask you to vote whether the gentleman shall speak."

The vote was put, and almost unanimously the throng voted to hear the questioner. Upon this he took the platform. As he uttered his first words, the young woman Suffragist asked him what his name was.

"Never mind my name," he replied. "That is not essential to the discussion of this matter. Besides, once several years ago when I asked a question of Miss Mary Coleman, the Suffragist lawyer, I was told that I simply wanted to get my name in the newspapers. There are so many in this movement on both sides who seem to be eager to get their names in the papers that I for one prefer not to give mine."

"Name, name," shouted a number of the Suffragists.

"Don't try to dodge the answer to your question by trying to get my name, for I am not seeking advertising. I want to get at the truth."

"Let him speak," "We don't care about the name," "Let's hear what he has to say," came from the crowd, whose nerves by that time were on the ragged edge. The questioner stood smiling on the platform, the coolest person in the gathering.

"If your permission for me to speak still holds, I am ready to make my explanation," said the questioner. He waited for a negative. None was heard. He then said:

"This is an unpleasant subject, but the women themselves have thrust it into the discussion, and I shall not run away from it. When women are arrested, as the young women has mentioned, they are punished because they have commercialized themselves. The men do not commercialize, do not sell themselves, and—"

"Yes, they do," shouted a woman Suffragist on the platform. The questioner instantly said: "Ladies and gentlemen, a women on this platform has just said that men in such cases commercialize themselves. I deny it. Will she kindly step forward and explain how men do that?"

At this point a nearby theromometer gave signs of bursting and the crowd was on tiptoe, but a young woman stepped up to the questioner and asked, "Have you a permit to speak?"

"Why should I have a permit when I am on this platform on your invitation?" the man replied.

"Well, I don't care; you have talked long enough," and a policeman pushed his way through the group on the platform and said, "The women want you to stop."

The questioner bowed and said: "That is always the way. When you pin the Suffragists down to facts they always run away." With that shot he quitted the platform, greeted by a round of applause from the crowd. The meeting then went on as before the interruption.

Kenneth Mackenzie of the Crescent apartments in Clinton street called at the Eagle office this morning and said:

"I sought out the questioner after the meeting and obtained his name and address. He tells me he is ready at any time to meet the Suffragists in a debate at Borough Hall, or in any hall, but he insists that he is not to be choked off when he gives things their right names, instead of dealing with generalities, and when he calls a spade a spade.

"The time has gone by for treating the women in debate with a gallantry that is abused and chivalry that is mocked in the Pankhurst fashion.

"I wish to say that the questioner's language was wholly respectful and dignified last evening, while his action showed that he was a person of education and good breeding."

The mass meeting last evening was held under the auspices of the Brooklyn Women's Political Union and they have planned a series of such meetings to be

held in all the parks during the summer.

Dr. L. Adele Cuinet opened the meeting and introduced Canon W. Sheaf Chase as the first speaker of the evening.

Plain Speaking that Suffragists May Understand

Editorial in The Brooklyn Daily Eagle, July 11

The bluntness of language of the male "Anti" who injected some inquiries into the Suffragists' meeting at Borough Hall on Wednesday evening was invited by the bluntness of a young women's question, and illustrates the danger to young women who enter upon the discussion of the ticklish question of the social evil with all the enthusiasm and with all the ignorance of youth.

It is not altogether unlikely that if the first outbreaks of the women of England, led by Mrs. Pankhurst, had been met with the same unsparing directness of speech which characterized the remarks of the man "Anti" at Borough Hall the air might rapidly have been cleared for a proper understanding of the grave sex and sexual distinctions underlying this subject of the ballot. Instead of this the women were met with generalities which were seemingly brushed aside by specious appeals to "justice" which had the more weight when the men declined to talk in public as plainly as they thought.

Nothing is ever gained by evasion in meeting the misguided enthusiasm of a wrongly directed crusade, and perhaps Premier Asquith and Chancellor Lloyd-George would have done better in the long run if they had not yielded to a mistaken gallantry and had talked of nature as it is. Those who take up the sword shall perish by the sword, and it may be equally true in this kind of crusade that those who seek to imitate masculine methods of force, however childish that imitation may be, will lose from the masculine directness of speech which they invite.

We are quite convinced that the interrupter at Borough Hall, in talking thus plainly in answer to the question recklessly flung at him by a thoughtless young woman crusader, in the bottom of his heart echoed the words of Hamlet in addressing his mother, "I must be cruel only to be kind."

Feminine Wanderlust

Fare you well! I am off down the long, rocky road,
And my heart shall grow light with the lift of the load;
I'll carol to beetle and cricket and bird
In a mystic, weird way that no mortal has heard.

I'll crumble the earth with my cool finger-tips
And crush the wild berries to redden my lips;
I will join in the revels of fairy and wight
And pile me a pillow of leaves for the night.

Ah, dreams are delicious and freedom is dear!
If the truth of it's known—why, I'd rather be here
With my foot on the crib and my work never done,
And the thrill of his lips at the drop of each sun.

JANE BURR.

Best Women Not at Polls Out in Denver

Helen Ware Says Representative Women Are Not Voting in Colorado Equal Suffrage Elections

From The Post Express, Rochester, N. Y., July 15

HELEN WARE, who is now appearing in "Within the Law" in New York, gives in the New York "Review" these pertinent views of the "votes for women" campaign:

"I believe in freedom of action regardless of sex. I do not think that women should be restrained from any calling or any pursuit simply because she is a woman. Brains rule the world, and it makes no difference whether they are in a masculine or a feminine head. 'Liberty, equality and fraternity should be the world's slogan today as it was in France in 1789, but with a far vaster significance.

"Personally I think that men have done pretty well at the head of affairs, and I am willing that they should remain there. Women can do much greater good in what has always been considered 'woman's sphere' than by invading man's domain.

"I am by no means sure that the majority of women even of the progressive type want to meddle in politics. I happened to be in Denver some time ago during a campaign, and on election day. Colorado, you know, was one of the pioneer Suffrage States. It was very evident in that campaign that the decent, representative part of Denver's women did not vote. The political bosses, on the other hand, rounded up all the disreputable women in the city and voted them to the last one.

"If representative women are going to refuse Suffrage when it is given them, then Women Suffrage will do more harm than good, because it will only increase the number of votes which can be bought and sold for money, or influence."

A Quotation

From The Common Cause, July, 1913

The family was once looked upon as the unit of society, an integral institution, stable and permanent. Today it is regarded as an ephemeral association, dissolvable for a number of capricious reasons, of no higher level and of no more value than a commercial contract.

Woman once stood upon a pedestal of veneration and privilege; she herself at the present hour is doing her best to kick down the pedestal, deny her privilege, and descend into the harsh and ugly arena of politics, where man is at his worst and human nature is most brutalized.

CONDE B. PALLEN, PH. D.

Against Educated Women

Professor Pembrey Says Present Ideal is Bad for Woman, Man and State

From The New York Times

LONDON, July 10—A vigorous challenge to the higher education of women is flung down by Dr. Marcus S. Pembrey, the well-known biologist and lecturer on physiology at Guy's hospital, in the publication, Science and Progress.

"The old-fashioned view of women's place in nature," Prof. Pembrey, declares, "is the one supported by biological knowledge. The slur cast upon 'Victorian mothers' has not been properly resented. True, they did not glory in competing in mental and physical contests with men, but they could and did bear large, healthy families.

"The possession of a baby is of more value to the State than a first-class certificate in classics or a silver trophy for sport."

As a result of higher education, Dr. Pembrey goes on to say, women find employment in posts which might be filled by men. There are late marriages which are bad for the health and morals of both sexes and bad for the State, as the families are smaller and less vigorous.

"The so-called higher education of women," the Professor asserts, "is not a good ideal for either woman, man or the State. Education at a university for three or four years makes a considerable demand upon the bodily, mental and pecuniary resources of a woman, and there is little doubt that these would be made useful to all concerned if devoted to or reserved for marriage. There is no evidence that a middle-aged intellectual woman makes a better wife or mother. The indications are all the other way.

"The woman who is married for her services as a cheap secretary or assistant in her husband's intellectual pursuits is as much degraded as a wife who is valued only as a cheap housekeeper and cook."

Summary of the Mad Deeds of the English Suffragettes

From The New York World, June 8

Here is a summary of the acts of violence by English Militant Suffragettes up to seizure by the Davison woman of King George's entry while running the Derby:

RIOTING—Eight years' siege of the House of Parliament, fighting the police with tooth and nail, with brickbats and bursting bombs of stifling acids; whips and red pepper; pelting them with tiles ripped off roofs with fire axes; charges of battalions of umbrella lances; jiu-jitsu and sky-rockets and Roman candles.

ASSAULT—Three times gave Premier Asquith voilent shakings; twice horsewhipped Winston Churchill; beat Sir Augustin Birrell, First Secretary for Ireland, into unconsciousness in St. James' Park; struck Lloyd-George in the face with a brass bound box; struck John Redmond with a brick; tortured a man caught in one of their meetings, pinching him and jabbing him with hatpins and stamping on him; threw him out of a window. Screamed threats of violence in Queen Mary's ear; hurled "Votes for Women" pamphlets at King George's head; wounded five hundred policemen and killed one.

MALICIOUS MISCHIEF—Smashed more than 10,000 windows in London buildings, stores, clubs, newspaper offices, government buildings; destroyed hundreds of thousands of letters by deluging mail boxes with burning acids, paint and refuse; threw acids into poll boxes on election day; ruined $5,000 worth of orchids in Kew Gardens; defaced valuable paintings in Royal Academy and Glasgow galleries; smashed historic relics in London Tower; tried to boycott the census; refused to pay dog tax; refused to pay property taxes, which under English law makes husbands liable to imprisonment; paraded with banners with libellous inscriptions; threats of kidnapping against Prince of Wales and children of Cabinet Ministers; cut down wires, crippling telephone and telegraph service; sent out false fire alarms all over London, liberated choking acid fumes at political meetings, hurled bricks and "Votes for Women" pamphlets through gallery windows at Lord Mayor's banquet to Cabinet Ministers in Guildhall; loaded letter boxes with pinfire cartridges that would explode like torpedoes when dropped; sent Cabinet Ministers packets of red pepper and snuff.

INCENDIARISM—Tried to burn British Museum; burned Royal Theatre and six fine residences; wrecked Lloyd-George's suburban home; burned building at Eton school; tried to burn track grandstands; tried to blow up three railroad stations; fired famous Nottingham Forest.

MISCELLANEOUS "STUNTS"—Tried to get into Parliament sessions disguised as men and messenger boys; hid in hot-air shaft in House of Commons and yelled protest; chained themselves to brass grating in women's gallery so they could not be ejected; broke up a thousand political meetings; waylaid cabinet ministers to follow and hoot and jeer them; tried to turn dances and receptions into "Votes for Women" demonstrations; noblewomen acting as charwoman and street sweepers to attract attention; marching side by side with women of the slums in public parades; organized drum and fife corps, and physical culture schools to develop muscle to fight the police; filled London's sky with rockets that scattered Suffragette pamphlets; dropping pamphlets from balloons and aeroplanes; sent themselves with stamps on their forehead through parcels post as "human letters" to Premier, who refused to see them.

RESULT—2,048 arrests, fines and imprisonments; rotten eggs; bombarded with mudclods and cricket bats; chased from public squares and streets; trampled, booed, hissed, whipped, spanked; utter defeat in Parliament of "Votes for Women" cause

MOTTO—"No Votes, No Peace."

Anti-Suffrage Organizations

National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

OFFICERS

Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, President, New York.
Mrs. Eli Whitney, Recording Secretary, New Haven
Mrs. Robert Garrett, Treasurer, Baltimore.
Miss Minnie Bronson, General Secretary, 37 West 39th street, New York.

STATE ASSOCIATIONS

CONNECTICUT

Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, President
" Walter S. Schulz, Secretary, 242 North Beacon street, Hartford

ILLINOIS

Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin, President
Miss J. C. Fairfield, Treasurer, 1523 Dearborn ave., Chicago
Mrs. George W. Kretzinger, Recording Secretary

IOWA

Mrs. John Flynn, President
" Simon Casady, Secretary; 715 Prospect Road, Des Moines

MARYLAND

Mrs. Robert Garrett, President, Baltimore
Miss Catherine P. Davis, Cor. Sec., Baltimore

MAINE

Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter, Secretary, Portland

MASSACHUSETTS

Mrs. James M. Codman, President; Brookline
Mrs. Charles P. Strong, Corresponding Secretary 687 Boylston street, Boston

MICHIGAN

Mrs. Henry F. Lyster, President
Miss Helen E. Keep, Secretary; 753 Jefferson avenue, Detroit

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mrs. A. T. Dudley, President; Exeter
Miss Grace Morrill, Cor. Secretary; Concord

NEW JERSEY

Mrs. E. Yarde Brees, President
Miss Julia Minnegerode, Cor. Sec., Trenton

NEW YORK

Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, President
Mrs. M. E. Loomis, Secretary, 37 West 39th st.

OHIO

Mrs. H. E. Talbot, President, Dayton

PENNSYLVANIA

Mrs. Horace Brock, President
" Brinton Coxe, Cor. Secretary; 1515 Spruce street, Philadelphia

RHODE ISLAND

Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, President
" A. G. Harkness, Secretary, 7 Cooke street, Providence

VERMONT

Mrs. Brookes Brown, President
" M. H. Buckham, Secretary; Burlington

VIRGINIA

Miss Jane M. Rutherford, President
Mrs. Charles M. Ferrell, Secretary; 1616 Grove avenue, Richmond

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mrs. Arthur W. Dunn, President; The Brighton
Miss C. L. Harrold, Secretary; 2101 N. street

WISCONSIN

Mrs. Frank W. Hoyt, President
Miss Genevieve Mills, Corresponding Secretary; 222 Monona avenue, Madison

Connecticut Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

HARTFORD

Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Pres.; 22 Sumner St.

VICE-PRESIDENTS

Miss Elizabeth R. Burnell, 35 Willard street
Mrs. J. G. Calhoun, 201 Farmington avenue
Mrs. W. B. Williams, 888 Asylum avenue
Mrs. W. S. Schulz, Secretary, 242 N. Beacon st.
Mrs. Albert S. Cook, Treasurer, 44 Sycamore Road